

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Frankie Lee Walker, II,)	Case No. 9:18-cv-03186-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Chaplain R. Morse, Mrs. Cummings,)	
Sgt. Erikson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's complaint alleging violations of his civil rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). Defendant Chaplain R. Morse filed a motion for summary judgment on May 7, 2019. ECF No. 43. Plaintiff filed a response. ECF No. 68. Defendant Mrs. Cummings filed a motion for summary judgment on July 22, 2019; and Defendant Sgt. Erikson filed a motion for summary judgment on August 21, 2019. ECF Nos. 62, 70. After each motion for summary judgment was filed the Court issued an Order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir.1975), advising Plaintiff of the summary judgment/dismissal procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. ECF Nos. 44, 63, 71. Despite the explanation of the summary judgment/dismissal procedure and the possible consequences for failing to respond,

Plaintiff did not respond to the last two motions. On October 23, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motions be granted. ECF No. 74. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report, and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

As stated above, Plaintiff has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. Accordingly, after considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Defendants' motions for summary judgment [43, 62, 70] are granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

November 18, 2019
Spartanburg, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.